

Remarks

The Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's final Office Action. The Applicants maintain that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Tucker in combination with Smernoff, as argued by the Examiner. The Applicants disagree with the Examiner's implication that the Applicants' invention is not distinct from Tucker in that the Applicants claim a keyplate. The keyplate is recited as part of the preamble to provide context for the claimed universal collar but does not form part of the Applicants' claimed invention. The claimed universal collar is designed to be inserted in dispensers having a keyplate and improves upon the art in that it secures the container within the dispenser without reliance on a key being inserted into the keyway formed in the keyplate, as is known in the art. The keyplate is recited in the preamble to provide the necessary context for the universal collar, which incorporates flanges that are axially spaced to receive the keyplate therebetween and secure the container. Tucker is typical of the art in that it has a keying system present on its collar to limit the container to one having an appropriate key. Consequently, one of ordinary skill would not modify Tucker as suggested by the Examiner. To clarify the nature of the invention, the independent claims have been amended to indicate that the universal collar is adapted to bypass a keying system.

With respect to the Examiner's statement that the Applicants rely on features not shown in the claims, namely, a vertical rib to limit rotation, the vertical rib is present in claim 2. To make its function more clear, the Applicants have amended claim 2 to explicitly state that this rib is adapted to interact with the dispenser to prevent rotation of the container. The Applicants believe that this puts the claims in condition for allowance or alternatively puts them in better condition for appeal and respectfully requests entry of the foregoing amendment. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendment and response.

Application No.: 10/693,567
Reply to Final Office Action of November 13, 2006

If any issues remain, or the Examiner believes further amendment is necessary to place the claims in condition for allowance, the Applicants respectfully request a telephone call to the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Shannon V. McCue, Reg. No. 42,859
Renner, Kenner, Grieve, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
Fourth Floor, First National Tower
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242

Attorney for Applicants